

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

RAMIN EIVAZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 12-C-910

MARK JONATHAN EDWARDS, et al,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER**

---

Following the imposition of sanctions, the Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a stay of the order requiring him and / or his former law firm to pay \$117,467.85 of the Defendants' attorney's fees as a sanction. The motion will be denied.

Plaintiff cites the hardship inherent in being required to pay a large amount of money, but his efforts on that score are cursory. More to the point, the normal rule is that when a sanction is ordered, it must be paid. Like any other ruling, it becomes part of the case subject to later review on appeal. "The propriety of the sanction may then be challenged on appeal once there is a final decision in the case, even if that is long after the sanction was paid." *Corley v. Rosewood Care Center, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1041, 1057 (7th Cir. 1998). And immediacy is in some sense part of the sanction itself: sanctions, unlike monetary judgments, are intended to be coercive, to punish bad behavior so that the parties change their ways within the course of the litigation. Delaying the payment until months or years later will not have the "sting" that a monetary sanction is intended to have.

Accordingly, the motion for a stay of the sanctions order is **DENIED**. Payment of the \$117,467.85 award should be made on or before April 13, 2015.

**SO ORDERED** this 10th day of March, 2015.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach, Chief Judge  
United States District Court - WIED